

ESTTA Tracking number: **ESTTA544909**

Filing date: **06/25/2013**

IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE  
BEFORE THE TRADEMARK TRIAL AND APPEAL BOARD

Proceeding	91210750
Party	Defendant Aguilar, Stephani A.
Correspondence Address	AGUILAR, STEPHANI A. 161 JEWETT AVE JERSEY CITY, NJ 07304-2003  polliwogphoto@gmail.com;s.fanny.aguilar
Submission	Answer
Filer's Name	Brian K Dinicola
Filer's e-mail	bdinicola@youngipt.com
Signature	/Brian K. Dinicola/
Date	06/25/2013
Attachments	POLLIWOG KIDS ANSWER.pdf(38321 bytes )

**UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE  
TRADEMARK TRIAL AND APPEAL BOARD**

In the Matter of Trademark Application Serial No. 85/806,650  
Published in the *Official Gazette* May 14, 2013

<b>Polliwogs, LLC</b>	)	
<b>d/b/a Polliwogs Children's Boutique</b>	)	
<b>Opposer,</b>	)	
	)	<b>Opposition No.: 91210750</b>
<b>v.</b>	)	
	)	
<b>Stephani Aguilar</b>	)	<b>Mark: POLLIWOG KIDS</b>
<b>d/b/a Polliwog Kids,</b>	)	
	)	
<b>Applicant.</b>	)	

**ANSWER TO NOTICE OF OPPOSITION AND  
AFFIRMATIVE DEFENSES**

Stephani Aguilar ("Applicant"), for her answer to the Notice of Opposition filed by Polliwogs, LLC ("Opposer") against application for registration of Applicant's trademark POLLIWOG KIDS, Serial No. 85-806,650 filed December 19, 2012, and published in the Official Gazette of May 14, 2012 (the "Mark"), pleads and avers as follows:

1. Answering paragraph 1 of the Notice of Opposition, Applicant admits the allegations thereof.
2. Answering paragraph 2 of the Notice of Opposition, Applicant does not have sufficient knowledge or information to form a belief as to the allegations contained therein and accordingly denies the allegations thereof.
3. Answering paragraph 3 of the Notice of Opposition, Applicant admits that Opposer is the owner of U.S. Trademark Application Serial No. 85-881,741 but denies that Opposer has used the mark POLLIWOGS in connection with any services prior to

December 19, 2012, and Applicant does not have sufficient knowledge or information to form a belief as to the remaining allegations contained therein and accordingly denies the remaining allegations thereof.

4. Answering paragraph 4 of the Notice of Opposition, Applicant admits that Opposer is the owner of U.S. Trademark Application Serial No. 85-881,745, but does not have sufficient knowledge or information to form a belief as to the remaining allegations contained therein and accordingly denies the remaining allegations thereof.

5. Answering paragraph 5 of the Notice of Opposition, Applicant denies the allegations thereof.

6. Answering paragraph 6 of the Notice of Opposition, Applicant does not have sufficient knowledge or information to form a belief as to the allegations contained therein and accordingly denies the allegations.

7. Answering paragraph 7 of the Notice of Opposition, Applicant denies the allegations thereof.

## **AFFIRMATIVE DEFENSES**

### **First Affirmative Defense**

8. Applicant affirmatively alleges that Opposer fails to state a claim upon which legal relief can be granted.

### **Second Affirmative Defense**

9. Applicant further affirmatively alleges, upon information and belief, that Opposer has unclean hands by virtue of having misrepresented Opposer's date of first use of POLLIWOGS, as a trademark or service mark in an attempt to establish itself as a senior

party in this Opposition.

10. Applicant further affirmatively alleges that upon information and belief, Opposer has falsely and fraudulently represented -- through trademark registration filings in both the State of North Carolina and in Ser. No. 85-881741 pending before the U.S. Patent and Trademark Office -- that it has been applying the mark “POLLIWOGS” in connection with “retail store services” since the year 2005, and that such mark has been in interstate commerce since 2005.

11. Upon information and belief, Applicant further affirmatively alleges that notwithstanding Opposer’s claims to the contrary, neither Opposer nor its apparent predecessor (a sole proprietor who was operating a local Greensboro, North Carolina clothing shop known as called “Polliwogs Children’s Boutique” until on or about May, 2012), had ever used the mark POLLIWOGS as an independently cognizable service mark or trademark – whether in intrastate *or* intrastate commerce -- prior to Applicant’s filing for registration of the Mark.

12. Finally, Applicant further affirmatively alleges that upon information and belief, neither Opposer nor its apparent predecessor had even used the name of the store “Polliwog’s Children Boutique” as a mark in *interstate* commerce prior to the filing of Applicant’s application to register the Mark. As such, Applicant affirmatively alleges that the claims by Opposer to have been using the mark POLLIWOGS in interstate commerce are knowingly and willfully false, and are made with fraudulent intent to deceive the U.S. Patent and Trademark Office.

### **Third Affirmative Defense**

13. Applicant further affirmatively alleges that there is no likelihood of confusion,

mistake or deception because, *inter alia*, the Mark and the alleged trademarks of Opposer are not confusingly similar; there are, upon information and belief, other *intrastate* users of third party marks with the “Polliwog” or “Polliwogs” formative; Applicant did not intend any association with any of Opposer’s alleged trademarks; and upon information and belief, ordinary prospective purchaser’s of Applicant’s products will not associate Applicant’s Mark with the Opposer’s pleaded marks.

#### **Fourth Affirmative Defense**

14. Applicant further affirmatively alleges that under the anti-dissection rule, any secondary meaning Opposer may have in its alleged trademarks -- by virtue of having used “POLLIWOGS CHILDREN’S BOUTIQUE” as the identification, upon information and belief, of a single store location in central North Carolina prior to Applicant’s date of filing to register the Mark – is narrowly circumscribed to the exact trademark it alleges to have been using in commerce prior to December 19, 2012. Any secondary meaning, therefore, can not and does not extend to the formative “Polliwog” (or “Polliwogs”), by itself, but must be viewed in its entirety against Applicant’s Mark in its entirety.

WHEREFORE, Applicant prays as follows:

(a) this opposition be dismissed; and

(b) a registration for the mark POLLIWOG BABY be issued to the Applicant.

Respectfully submitted this 25<sup>th</sup> day of June, 2013.

**DINICOLA & YOUNG, PC**  
**Attorneys for Applicant**

/s/ Brian K. Dinicola

Brian K. Dinicola

NJ State Bar No. 8411994  
475 Wall St.  
Princeton, NJ 08540  
Telephone: (609) 642-4579  
Facsimile: (609) 683-9633  
Email: bdinicola@youngipt.com

### **CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE**

The undersigned hereby certifies that on this 25th day of June, 2013, a true copy of the foregoing ANSWER AND AFFIRMATIVE DEFENSES was served in the following manner:

#### **VIA FIRST CLASS MAIL**

Frank M. Caprio  
Angela Holt  
BRADLEY ARANT BOULT  
CUMMINGS LLP  
200 Clinton Avenue, Suite 900  
Huntsville, AL 35801

### **CERTIFICATE OF ELECTRONIC FILING**

The undersigned certifies that this submission (along with any paper referred to as being attached or enclosed) is being filed with the United States Patent and Trademark Office via the Electronic System for Trademark Trials and Appeals (ESTTA) on this 25th day of June 2013.

By: /s/ Brian K. Dinicola  
Brian K. Dinicola

Dinicola & Young, PC  
475 Wall St  
Princeton NJ 08540  
(609) 642-4579

Attorneys for Applicant